



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

responsibility'. Those phrases were the 'Samson's locks' of General Jackson" (p. 40).

Perhaps the most valuable new letter between 1855 and 1861 is that criticizing suggested corrections in his Cooper Union speech, which illustrates his total absence of literary vanity, and his exacting study of correct expression (pp. 149-151).

The letters of the presidential period are probably of the greatest new interest. A letter to the King of Siam succeeds in being courtly without excluding individuality, in the delightful clause, thanking his Majesty for "two elephants' tusks of length and magnitude such as indicate that they could have belonged only to an animal which was a native of Siam" (p. 202). His wide conception of the forces creating public opinion is illustrated by his suggestion, in 1863, to Bayard Taylor, that he give a lecture on "Serfs, Serfdom, and Emancipation in Russia" (p. 237). His own patience is shown by his repeated requests to his subordinates to hear patiently various claimants, who have passed through his hands. Sometimes he orders action, usually on some such ground as, "There is some peculiar reason for it" (p. 194): a form, hinting political pressure, which saves him from the appearance of dictating on grounds of judgment. Usually he leaves the subordinate free to act, but asks that something be done; for instance "in any not unreasonable way" (p. 242). Frequently he jocularly passes on applicants as: "I do not personally know these ladies, but cheerfully endorse Judge Wylie and Mayor Wallock" [obviously their endorsers] (p. 249).

On the whole not many new particular facts are brought out in these letters, but our picture of Lincoln is both confirmed and substantially broadened, and they, of themselves, are sufficient to make their readers lovers of Lincoln.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

The Memoirs of Colonel John S. Mosby. Edited by CHARLES WELLS RUSSELL. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1917. Pp. xxi, 414. \$3.00.)

IF the present generation of Americans were more familiar than it is with the events of the American Civil War, it would be better able to comprehend and classify such details as are made known to us concerning the present war. A generation of Americans grown up in an era of profound peace, an era controlled largely by feminine standards, is shocked, when war suddenly startles their gentle world, by incidents and details that have attended every war in human history.

To such, the reading of Colonel Mosby's memoirs may be a preventive of hysteria, a preservative of sanity. Mosby once wrecked a Union railroad train which was running to Sheridan's army then in the Shenandoah valley. The train carried, besides army supplies, a number of civilian passengers, including some women. The entirely correct

comment recorded in Colonel Mosby's memoirs upon this war-time expedient is that people who travel upon a railroad train in a country where military operations are going on take the risk of all the accidents of war. He adds: "I was not conducting an insurance business on life and property."

Again, when Mosby was informed that a number of women and children from among persons in the North, who sympathized with the South, would be placed on the trains running to Sheridan, the purpose of this familiar device, of course, being to make the trains safe from his attack, he replied that he did not understand that it hurt women and children to be killed any more than it hurt men. In November, 1864, he wrote a letter to General Sheridan, which can be considered with profit by Americans to-day. Sheridan had captured six of Mosby's men and had them shot. Mosby wrote to Sheridan that after this had been done he had captured more than seven hundred of Sheridan's men and had sent them to Richmond, but that now having taken prisoners from Custer's division, the command which had executed the six Confederates, he had executed seven of them. Thereafter, he announced, his captives would be treated as prisoners of war unless new grounds were given for retaliation. The exchange of this particular manifestation of military courtesy here came to an end.

Alternating through these interesting memoirs are narratives of daring exploits, the accounts of which sometimes disagree substantially with the Northern official reports of the same affairs, and serious studies of several important battles and campaigns, including the first Bull Run battle and the Gettysburg campaign. Colonel Mosby was a free lance both in war and in peace. With him a report or despatch carried weight according to its degree of accuracy. A great name signed to it, whether it was Lee's, Longstreet's, or Johnston's, did not deter him from pointing out its error, if error existed.

He says that the Confederacy was lost at the battle of Bull Run because of the failure of Johnston and Beauregard to press on to the capture of Washington. He lays at rest finally, and without hope of resurrection, the view advanced by Confederate soldiers and biographers and by so many historians, North and South, that Lee's cavalry leader, Stuart, by his absence from the army lost the battle of Gettysburg. He shows that Stuart was absent from Lee's army during the preliminary movements in accordance with the directions of Lee and Longstreet. He disposes finally of that persistent and picturesque story that Longstreet's scout, Harrison, brought to Lee in Pennsylvania the first information that the Army of the Potomac was marching northward through Maryland. He visits merited criticism upon the movements of General Joseph E. Johnston, who began to retire before his opponents early in the year 1861, and continued retiring, much as General Nathanael Greene did in 1781, until the end of the war.

The truth is that few of the military movements, North or South, on a large scale during the Civil War will bear serious scrutiny, and most of the histories of the war will bear less. The best books relating to it are still the special books like Colonel Mosby's, Major John Bigelow's *Chancellorsville*, the *Fredericksburg* by Colonel Henderson of the British army, and Colonel Haskell's spirited and contemporary narrative, occasionally inaccurate in detail, of the Gettysburg battle. So little adaptability to scientific military processes have the American people shown that after more than a half-century they have failed to discover what was best done in the Civil War and of what was ill done they know only the most glaring examples.

ISAAC R. PENNYPACKER.

A History of the United States since the Civil War. By ELLIS PAXSON OBERHOLTZER. In five volumes. Volume I., 1865-1868. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1917. Pp. xi, 579. \$3.50.)

THERE is something very unconventional and business-like in the manner of Dr. Oberholtzer's entrance upon this serious undertaking. He gives us no preface—not even a "foreword", no introduction, no bibliographical note, no brief synopsis of his interpretation of history in general and of American history in particular, no acknowledgments of valuable aid from assorted librarians and specialists, no deprecatory suggestions aimed at possible reviewers. He does, indeed, present a table of contents; but promptly at the conclusion of that the first chapter of the history opens briskly and precisely "On Sunday morning, April 2, 1865". Where the story is going to end is nowhere stated. Probably the author does not know and does not care to guess. All that he feels reasonably sure of is that it will be five volumes long. He has before him the cases of Rhodes and McMaster, and seeks to profit by their examples. McMaster named at the outset both the number of his volumes and the end of his story; he made good on the latter point, but his completed work shows eight volumes instead of the five that he announced. Rhodes said nothing about the number of volumes, but fixed the end of his story at 1884; his completed work, if it is completed, ends at 1877. Oberholtzer will be able to fulfill his promise of five volumes by the simple expedient of stopping the story at the end of volume five.

The present volume covers only three years. Of the eight chapters three deal with the political struggle over reconstruction, four with social and economic conditions after the war, and one with foreign relations that especially affected America—"Mexico, Ireland, and Alaska". This distribution of the writer's attention indicates very well the general type of his work. It is in the school of McMaster. It will tell the story of the American People as a social rather than a political entity. It will be as catholic in its scope as the satire of Juvenal: